

REMARKS

Claims 81-91 and 103-105 remain pending. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the following remarks. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has object to the Title as not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title.

The Examiner has objected to the Appendix as too long and not a computer program listing. The application has been amended to incorporate the material in the Appendix into the main body of the application.

Claims 81-86 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ludolph et al. (USPN: 6,239,798). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 81-86 generally relate to techniques in which an image containing information is introduced into a display window, for example a virtual device, so as to create an appearance that the introduced image is sliding into the display window, and removing an image containing information from the display window so as to create the appearance that the removed image is sliding out of the display window. As the applicants explain at page 12 of the application, this technique advantageously "maintains a feeling that the virtual device is a single instrument, not a plurality of individual windows of the type normally found on windows based computers."

Nothing in Ludolph teaches or describes the claimed methods. Ludolph discloses techniques for managing the display of windows corresponding to tasks executing on a computer. (col. 2, ll. 39-42). A window panel may be displayed that includes icons corresponding to the executing tasks, and permits shared access to a window of the executing tasks upon selection of a corresponding icon displayed in the window panel. (col. 2, ll. 44-48). Ludolph teaches that the window panel may be a "sliding window panel 220." (col. 13, line 19). "To minimize cluttering the user interface, window panel 220 is normally hidden. When hidden, its existence is indicated to the user by a thin, vertical strip along the left edge of screen 140. The user can open window panel 220 by moving the pointer to the left edge of screen 140. This causes window panel 220 to slide out from under selector 210 into the position shown in Fig. 2a." (col. 13, ll. 19-26).

Thus, while Ludolph refers to a window panel which may slide onto the display screen from a hidden position, Ludolph fails to describe or teach techniques in which an image containing information is introduced into a display window so as to create an appearance that the introduced image is sliding into the display window, and removing an image containing information from the display window so as to create the appearance that the removed image is sliding out of the display window.

None of the portions of Ludolph referred to by the Examiner provides the required description. Col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 8 of Ludolph describes elements of the HotJava Views interface. None of the elements is described as involving the display of images sliding into or out of a window. Col. 5, ll. 46-49 of Ludolph describes that a user may hide a window and the computer retains an icon representing the hidden window in the window panel, and stores the location and size of the window so that it may be subsequently displayed as it existed before it was hidden. Again, there is no description here of the display of images sliding into or out of a window.

Col. 1, lines 64-65 of Ludolph describes that a window is opened when a new task is launched in the Windows 95 operating system, without any reference to the display of images sliding into or out of a window. Col. 2, lines 7-9 of Ludolph describes closing a task in the Windows 95 operating system by clicking on a button, also without reference to the display of images sliding into or out of a window. Col. 6, lines 63-67 of Ludolph describes hierarchical pull-down menus. There is no description of the display of images sliding into or out of a window.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Ludolph does not anticipate claims 81-86.

Claim 87 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Ludolph in view of Ruff (USPN: 6,243,102). For the following reasons, applicants traverse this rejection.

The Examiner asserts that Ludolph discloses the "invention as claimed" but does not disclose "the limitation of a rate that the images slide into and out of the display window is user selectable." Claim 87 depends from claim 82 and the Examiner's rejection of claim 87 assumes that Ludolph discloses all of the limitations of claim 82. As explained above, this assumption is incorrect. For at least this reason, claim 87 is not obvious over Ludolph in view of Ruff.

Claims 88 and 90-91 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Ludolph in view of Warrin (USPN: 5,640,522). Claim 89 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Ludolph in view of Warrin in further view of Niblack (USPN: 6,181,342). Applicants traverse these rejections and respectfully disagree that the cited references teach or suggest every limitation of these rejected claims.

Independent claim 88 (from which claims 89-91 depend) recites a method of providing visual effects for a media player running under a window based operating system including displaying, in a single window of the window-based operating system, a user interface region with a display window integrated into the user interface region and displaying on the display window visual effects corresponding to material being played on the media player. Thus these claims relate to techniques for displaying visual effects corresponding to material being played in a media player.

The Examiner asserts that Ludolph discloses a media player and that Warrin discloses "providing visual effects corresponding to material being displayed." Carefully examination of the cited references reveals no such disclosure. The Examiner cites to the description in Ludolph of the HotJava Views interface as disclosing a media player. The cited portions of Ludolph contain no such description. Rather, as the Examiner's acknowledges, Ludolph describes the HotJava Views as having the following components: "Selector-An Intuitive 'push-button' GUI, Mailview, Calendar View, NameView, [and] InfoView – A Web browser for viewing intranet documents and Intranet documents." None of the descriptions of these elements indicates that they are (or include) a media player.

The Applicants also disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Warrin. Warrin discloses to a method and system for previewing transition effects between pairs of images in a presentation program. In the portion cited by the Examiner (col. 3, lines 39-42), Warrin describes that a user may preview a presentation effect by selecting a presentation effect indication. Thus Warrin describes displaying a presentation effect that has been selected for a presentation. However Warrin does not describe displaying visual effects corresponding to material being played.

For at least these reasons, claims 88-91 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant : Al-Riaz Adatia et al.
Serial No. : 09/593,877
Filed : June 14, 2000
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-498001

New claims 103-105 have been added. These claims all depend from claim 88, are allowable for at least the reasons stated above.